Analyzing critical propagation in a reaction-diffusion-advection model using unstable slow waves

Frederike Kneer,[1, a)] Klaus Obermayer,[1] and Markus A. Dahlem[2]

[1)] *Department of Software Engineering and Theoretical Computer Science, Technische Universität Berlin, Ernst-Reuter-Platz 7, D-10587 Berlin, Germany*

[2)] *Department of Physics, Humboldt Universität zu Berlin, Robert-Koch-Platz 4, 10115 Berlin, Berlin, Germany*

(Dated: 24 April 2014)

The effect of advection on the critical minimal speed of traveling waves is studied. Previous theoretical studies estimated the effect on the velocity of stable fast waves and predicted the existence of a critical advection strength below which propagating waves are not supported anymore. In this paper, the critical advection strength is calculated taking into account the unstable slow wave solution. Thereby, theoretical results predict, that advection can induce stable wave propagation in the non-excitable parameter regime, if the advection strength exceeds a critical value. In addition, an analytical expression for the advection-velocity relation of the unstable slow wave is derived. Predictions are confirmed numerically in a two-variable reaction-diffusion model.

arXiv:1404.5824v1 [nlin.PS] 23 Apr 2014

I. INTRODUCTION

Traveling waves are basic patterns emerging in excitable media and are observed in many physical, chemical, and biological systems. In chemical systems, propagating excitation waves can be found in the Belousov-Zhabotinsky (BZ) reaction[1,2]. Many important examples of excitation waves are found in biological systems, in particular, neuronal systems, such as the action potential, a wave of electrical depolarization that propagates along the membrane of a nerve cell axon with constant shape and velocity[3], or spreading depression (SD), a wave of sustained cell and tissue depolarization caused by a massive release of Gibbs free energy that propagates through gray matter tissue[4,5]. Besides, intracellular waves of calcium have been observed[6,7]. In physical systems, a large variety of spatiotemporal patterns has been shown to occur during the oxidation of CO on a Pt(110) surface[8–10].

As a model for these traveling waves, we consider excitable media of activator-inhibitor type. This macroscopic description is used to study the generic behavior of traveling waves in reaction-diffusion-advection systems. The spatial coupling within the medium is primarily given by diffusion, while advection is introduced in either of two ways. First, external forcing can lead to advection which changes the excitation properties of the unforced reaction-diffusion system. In this case, the advection term models the mean flow, for instance, of ions driven by an externally applied constant electrical field[11,12]. This case has been studied in the chemical BZ reaction[13,14] and in some preliminary studies in cortical SD[15]. Second, in two-dimensional reaction-diffusion media, a small curvature of a wave front can also formally lead to an advection term under some approximations resulting in a reduced reaction-diffusion-advection description in one dimension[12,16,17]. Front curvature effects have been observed in the BZ reaction[18,19]. Furthermore, drifting pulses that form via an advection instability in a reaction-diffusion medium with differential advection

[a)] Electronic mail: fkneer@ni.tu-berlin.de

have been analyzed[20] and critical properties of traveling waves affected by advection have been discussed[12,16,21].

It has been shown, that advection can have destructive and constructive effects on traveling waves, namely, slowing them down and even abolish them at a critical speed, and accelerating them and even facilitate propagation of traveling waves in the parameter regime in which the system without advection is non-excitable, respectively. Here we investigate in particular the latter non-excitable regime, which without advection does not support traveling waves. In this regime, the current analytical approximation fails. We provide an extended analytical approximation and compare our results also with numerically simulations.

II. FITZHUGH-NAGUMO IN CO-MOVING FRAME AND WITH ADVECTION

A. FitzHugh-Nagumo dynamics

Let us firstly consider excitable media of activator-inhibitor type in one spatial dimension with diffusion,

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = f(u,v) + D_u \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2}, \tag{1}$$

$$\frac{\partial v}{\partial t} = \varepsilon g(u,v) + D_v \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2}. \tag{2}$$

This system has two variables $u(x,t)$ and $v(x,t)$ called activator and inhibitor, respectively, that depend on time t and space x. The parameters D_u and D_v are the diffusion coefficients of activator u and inhibitor v, respectively. The parameter ε is the time scale ratio between u and v.

Next, we specify the activator rate function $f(u,v)$ and inhibitor rate function $g(u,v)$ as FitzHugh-Nagumo dynamics[22–24], that is, $f(u,v) = 3u - u^3 - v$ and $g(u,v) = (u + \beta + \gamma v)$. Note, that in the most general case of FitzHugh-Nagumo systems—defined as $f(u,v)$ having a cubic nonlinearity in the first argument u and being linear otherwise, in particular, $g(u,v)$ is linear—there are only three free parameters: ε, β, and γ. With diffusion, only one more free parameter is introduced, because one of the two diffusion coefficients D_u and D_v can be set to unity by scaling space.

FitzHugh-Nagumo dynamics is chosen, as it provides a mathematically tractable excitable medium of activator-inhibitor type and we further simplify this system to obtain only two free parameter as follows. Inhibitor diffusion is assumed to be slow and hence negligible, i.e., $D_v = 0$. In the remainder, we refer to D_u as D and note that formally, it is not a free parameter anymore as it can be set to unity by scaling x accordingly. Moreover, we chose to set $\gamma = 0$. These simplifications are further discussed in Sec. V.

With only the two parameters ε and β left, the influence of an additional advection term is more easy to illustrate and also the suitable regime of β can readily be seen. The parameter ε has to be chosen, in any case, much smaller than unity, because only slow inhibitor kinetics render dynamics excitable. In the local FitzHugh-Nagumo system ($D_u = D_v = 0$) and at any arbitrary position x_0, the parameter β determines whether the dynamics at x_0 is in the excitable regime ($\beta > 1$) or exhibits self-sustained periodic oscillations ($\beta < 1$). In the following, we only consider the excitable regime, which is in parameter space near the oscillatory regime.

B. Traveling waves and co-moving coordinate frame

Next, we consider traveling waves, i.e., solutions of Eqs. (1)-(2) with a constant propagation velocity c and unaltered wave profile $u(x,t) = u(\xi)$, $v(x,t) = v(\xi)$, that is, a stationary profile in the co-moving coordinate $\xi = x + ct$. Without loss of generality, we only consider waves propagating in negative x-direction, see Fig. 1a.

Traveling waves are stationary profiles in co-moving coordinate frames. To find these, Eqs. (1)-(2) then can




FIG. 1. Illustration of (a) activator and inhibitor profiles propagating in an external electrical field and (b) two-dimensional V-shaped pattern (top view, red indicates the area with $u > 0$).

be transformed to

$$c\frac{\partial u}{\partial \xi} = 3u - u^3 - v + D\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial \xi^2}, \tag{3}$$

$$c\frac{\partial v}{\partial \xi} = \varepsilon(u + \beta). \tag{4}$$

An advection term, added to Eq. (1) or Eq. (3), may arise through different mechanisms.

C. Advection

Let us only briefly mention the quantities and how they relate formally to an advection term in an 1D approximation of curved RD fronts in spatially two-dimensional media[16]. Propagating slightly curved wave fronts ($R \ll L$), where L is the width of the rising front, can be approximated by

$$c(A)\frac{\partial u}{\partial \xi} = 3u - u^3 - v + D\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial \xi^2} + A\frac{\partial u}{\partial \xi}, \tag{5}$$

$$c(A)\frac{\partial v}{\partial \xi} = \varepsilon(u + \beta), \tag{6}$$

with $A = \frac{D}{R}$, where R is the curvature radius of the front. For a detailed derivation, see Ref.[16]. The term $A\frac{\partial u}{\partial \xi}$ is called advection term.

As it is not readily obvious, we will also briefly derive that basically the same set of equations, i.e., Eqs. (5)-(6), can be obtained, if one considers advection due to a constant external driving force. Both, activator u and inhibitor v can be associated with particles of different mobilities m_u and m_v. It seems that we can also neglect m_v, because we already assumed inhibitor diffusion to be negligible and the diffusion coefficient is related to the mobility through the Einstein relation $D = mkT$, where k is Boltzmann's constant, and T the absolute temperature. Note, however, that we have to consider the electrical mobility μ, which is the mobility m times the charge q of the particle. For ions or charged macromolecules, the charge q is the valence number z times the elementary charge e of the electron, thus, $\mu = mze$. Therefore, the absolute value of the quotient of the electrical mobilities $|\mu_v/\mu_u|$ is not necessarily much smaller than unity, even if $m_v/m_u \ll 1$. Since a large valence number z is only found in large charged macromolecules, which indeed have a much smaller mobility m, an advection term in the inhibitor equation despite the fact that we set the diffusion to zero is a reasonable assumption.

Particle motion could then be affected by a homogeneous external field (e.g. an electrical field of strength E), which is applied parallel to the propagation direction, and Eqs. (3)-(4) read

$$c\frac{\partial u}{\partial \xi} = 3u - u^3 - v + D\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial \xi^2} + \mu_u F\frac{\partial u}{\partial \xi}, \tag{7}$$

$$c\frac{\partial v}{\partial \xi} = \varepsilon(u + \beta) + \mu_v F\frac{\partial v}{\partial \xi}, \tag{8}$$

where F is the strength of the field and $zE = -F$ with the valence z of the ion.

Changing the velocity of the co-moving frame to $\tilde{c}$,

$$\tilde{c} = c - \mu_v F. \tag{9}$$

One can interpret this system in the co-moving frame with $\tilde{c}$ as a system with advection only in the activator with advection strength A, see Fig. 1a. For $\tilde{c} = c(A)$, this yields

$$c(A)\frac{\partial u}{\partial \xi} = 3u - u^3 - v + D\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial \xi^2} + A\frac{\partial u}{\partial \xi}, \tag{10}$$

$$c(A)\frac{\partial v}{\partial \xi} = \varepsilon(u + \beta), \tag{11}$$

where $\xi = x - (c - \mu_v F)t$ and $A = F(\mu_u - \mu_v)$. The first and the second mechanism now are described by the same equation, as Eqs. (10)-(11) and Eqs. (5)-(6) are the

same. In stationary coordinates, this reads

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = 3u - u^3 - v + D\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} + A\frac{\partial u}{\partial x}, \tag{12}$$

$$\frac{\partial v}{\partial t} = \varepsilon(u + \beta). \tag{13}$$

For $c(A) > 0$ (propagation in negative x-direction), $A > 0$ can be interpreted as an approximation to small positive curvature of a wave front propagationg in a spatial 2D medium, that e.g. exhibit so-called V-shaped pattern[25], see Fig. 1b. Interpreting the activator variable u and the inhibitor variable v as the concentration of different charged ions, $A > 0$ corresponds to a constant electrical field externally applied parallel to the propagation direction. For example, activator u being positive charged ions and inhibitot v being noncharged, $A > 0$ corresponds to an electrical field that has the same direction as the propagation direction, see Fig. 1a.

III. THEORY

In this section, we derive an approximation for the critical velocity and the corresponding critical advection strength Sec. III C. To this end, we first define the propagation boundary Sec. III A and then derive the advection-velocity relation for unstable waves in Sec. III B.

A. Propagation boundary

FitzHugh-Nagumo system without advection (Eqs. (1)-(2)) ($1 < \beta < \sqrt{3}$ and ε sufficiently small) has a stable fast wave solution and an unstable slow wave solution which correspond to homoclinic orbits of the related ODE problem (Eqs. (3)-(4)), see Ref.[26]. There exists a critical line ∂P in the (ε, β) space, at which the fast wave branch collides with the slow wave branch. For values of β and ε above this critical line, propagation of traveling waves cannot be obtained. These properties carry over to the case of finite advection strength A. Thus it is reasonable to take into account the slow wave solution when calculating the critical properties, i.e. the critical surface in the (ε, β, A) space, which separates the excitable and the non-excitable parameter regime and a critical velocity c_{cr} depending on advection A.

The nonlinear Eikonal equation[16] provides a good approximation for the advection-velocity relation of the fast wave solution, if the wave speed is decelerated ($A < 0$). The nonlinear Eikonal equation has also been used to calculate a critical velocity and a critical advection strength[16]. The critical advection strength A_{cr} derived from the nonlinear Eikonal equation provides a good approximation for the critical advection strength A_{cr} (see Appendix) needed for loss of excitability in the parameter regime $\beta < \partial P_{A=0}$ (see Fig.2). Under the influence of advection $A < 0$, the propagation boundary is shifted to smaller threshold values β.

Numerical calculations (see Sec. IV) show that positive advection $A > 0$ induces stable wave propagation in the parameter regime $\beta > \partial P_{A=0}$, the propagation boundary is shifted to larger threshold values β. In this parameter range, theory strongly deviates from numerical calculations, thus this behaviour is not explained by the nonlinear Eikonal equation.

B. Advection-velocity relation for the fast and slow wave solution

In this section, the advection-velocity relation of the slow wave is derived in the same way as the known advection-velocity relation for the fast wave. Rewriting Eqs. (10)-(11) (see Ref.[16]),

$$(c(A) - A)\frac{\partial u}{\partial \xi} = 3u - u^3 - v + D\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial \xi^2}, \tag{14}$$

$$c(A)\frac{\partial v}{\partial \xi} = \varepsilon(u + \beta). \tag{15}$$

and introducing c^* and ε^*

$$c^* = c(A) - A, \tag{16}$$

$$\varepsilon^* = \varepsilon\frac{c^*}{c(A)}, \tag{17}$$




FIG. 2. Critical advection strength A_{cr} as a function of threshold size β. The grey dashed line shows the results from Eq.(37), which was derived from the nonlinear Eikonal equation. The blue solid line shows the results from Eqs. (12)-(13) computed with *AUTO* by continuating homoclinic solutions; the propagation boundary $\partial P_{A=0}$ is computed from Eqs. (1)-(2). ($\varepsilon = 0.022$ in all cases.) The blue solid line separates the excitable from the non-excitable parameter regime.

yields

$$c^* \frac{\partial u}{\partial \xi} = 3u - u^3 - v + D\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial \xi^2}, \tag{18}$$

$$c^* \frac{\partial v}{\partial \xi} = \varepsilon^*(u + \beta), \tag{19}$$

which has the same form as the FitzHugh-Nagumo model without advection (Eqs. (3)-(4)). Thus c^* has the same dependency on ε^* and β as the propagation velocity $c|_{A=0}$ (see Eqs. (3)-(4)) on ε and β. The velocity $c|_{A=0}$ for the fast and the slow wave can then approximately be calculated using a singular perturbation theory[27]. The propagation velocity of the fast, $c^f|_{A=0}$, and the slow, $c^s|_{A=0}$, wave is then obtained of

$$c^f|_{A=0} = c_0 + \varepsilon c_1^f, \tag{20}$$

$$c^s|_{A=0} = \sqrt{\varepsilon} c_1^s. \tag{21}$$

The expressions for c_0, c_1^f and c_1^s are provided in the Appendix.

For c^* Eqs. (18)-(19) we, therefore, obtain the expressions

$$c^{f*} = c_0 + \varepsilon^* c_1^f, \tag{22}$$

$$c^{s*} = \sqrt{\varepsilon^*} c_1^s.. \tag{23}$$

Inserting $c^* = c(A) - A$ and $\varepsilon^* = \varepsilon \frac{c^*}{c(A)} = \varepsilon \frac{c(A)-A}{c(A)}$ (see Eqs. (16)-(17)), we obtain

$$c^f(A) - A = c_0 + \varepsilon \frac{c^f(A) - A}{c^f(A)} c_1^f, \tag{24}$$

$$c^s(A) - A = \sqrt{\varepsilon \frac{c^s(A) - A}{c^s(A)}} c_1^s. \tag{25}$$

Solving for $c^f(A)$, we obtain the so-called nonlinear Eikonal equation

$$c_\pm^f(A) = \frac{1}{2}((A + c_0 + \varepsilon c_1) \pm \sqrt{(A + c_0 + \varepsilon c_1)^2 - 4\varepsilon A c_1}), \tag{26}$$

where $c_+^f(A)$ is the valid advection-velocity relation, because $c_+^f|_{A=0} = c_+ + \varepsilon c_1^f$, see[16].

Solving Eq.(25) for $c^s(A)$, we obtain

$$c_\pm^s(A) = \frac{1}{2}(A \pm \sqrt{A^2 + 4\varepsilon c_1^{s2}}),$$
$$c_3^s(A) = A. \tag{27}$$

The valid advection-velocity relation for the slow wave (with $c^s(A) > 0$) is $c_+^s(A)$, because $c^s|_{A=0} \equiv \sqrt{\varepsilon} c_1^s$.

C. Critical velocity and critical advection strength

Here, the critical velocity $c_{cr}(A_{cr})$, which exhibits a traveling wave at the connection of the fast wave and the slow wave branch affected by a critical advection of strength A_{cr}, is calculated. Also an expression for A_{cr} is captured by this calculations.

In a FitzHugh-Nagumo model without advection (Eqs. (1)-(2)), there exists a critical line in the (ε, β) parameter space, above which wave propagation is impossible. At the critical time scale ratio ε_{cr}, the single homoclinic solution of Eqs. (3)-(4) corresponds to the connection between the fast wave branch and the slow wave branch, and the propagation velocity of the fast wave is minimal ($c_{cr}|_{A=0}$).

The critical time scale ratio ε_{cr} as a function of β can be approximated by solving $c^s|_{A=0} = c^f|_{A=0}$ for ε_{cr}, where $c^f|_{A=0}$ and $c^s|_{A=0}$ are calculated using singular pertur-

bation theory (Eqs. (20)-(21)). This yields

$$\varepsilon_{cr}^{\pm}(\beta) = \frac{-2c_0c_1^f + c_1^{s2} \pm \sqrt{-4c_0c_1^fc_1^{s2} + c_1^{s4}}}{2c_1^{f2}}, \quad (28)$$

where $\varepsilon_{cr}^- < \varepsilon_{cr}^+$ and thus $\varepsilon_{cr} = \varepsilon_{cr}^-$, compare Sec.(IV). For the critical velocity $c_{cr}|_{A=0}$ as a function of β we then obtain of Eqs. (20)-(21)

$$c_{cr}|_{A=0} = c_0 + \varepsilon_{cr}c_1^f = \sqrt{\varepsilon_{cr}}c_1^s. \quad (29)$$

Advection changes the critical velocity. To obtain an analytical expression for $c_{cr}(A_{cr})$, we again start from Eqs. (18)-(19), which has the same form as FitzHugh-Nagumo model without advection Eqs. (3)-(4). Substituting c^* for $c_{cr}|_{A=0}$ and ε^* for ε_{cr}, the homoclinic solution of Eqs. (18)-(19) ceases to exist at the connection between the fast wave branch and the slow wave branch. Thus, the critical velocity $c_{cr}(A_{cr})$ in systems affected by advection can be derived from Eqs. (16)-(17) by setting $c^* = c_{cr}|_{A=0}$ and $\varepsilon^* = \varepsilon_{cr}$. With $c^* = c(A) - A$ and $\varepsilon^* = \varepsilon\frac{c^*}{c(A)}$ it follows, that

$$c_{cr}|_{A=0} = c_{cr}(A_{cr}) - A_{cr}, \quad (30)$$

$$\varepsilon_{cr} = \varepsilon\frac{c_{cr}|_{A=0}}{c_{cr}(A_{cr})}, \quad (31)$$

where $c_{cr}|_{A=0}$ is the minimal propagation velocity of the fast wave for $A = 0$ (Eq.(29)) and $c_{cr}(A_{cr})$ is the minimal propagation velocity of the fast wave, that can be achieved by influencing the system with critical advection A_{cr}.

Solving Eq.(31) for $c_{cr}(A_{cr})$ and Eq.(30) for A_{cr}, we finally obtain

$$c_{cr}(A_{cr}) = \frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon_{cr}}c_{cr}|_{A=0}, \quad (32)$$

$$A_{cr} = c_{cr}(A_{cr}) - c_{cr}|_{A=0} = c_{cr}|_{A=0}(\frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon_{cr}} - 1). \quad (33)$$

Be aware that $c_{cr}|_{A=0}$ Eq.(29) as well as ε_{cr} Eq.(28) are fully determined by β. Thus Eq.(33) is an approximation for the critical surface in the (ε, β, A) space, above which propagating waves are not supported. As a function of A and β it reads

$$\varepsilon = \frac{(A + c_{cr}|_{A=0})\varepsilon_{cr}}{c_{cr}|_{A=0}}. \quad (34)$$

For values of ε above this critical surface, wave propagation is impossible.

IV. NUMERICAL VALIDATION

Fig.(3) shows the propagation velocity of the fast, $c^f(A)$, and the slow, $c^s(A)$, waves as a function of advection strength A for different values of β (Fig.(3)(a)) and ε (Fig.(3)(b)). The analytical advection-velocity relation for the slow wave Eq.(27) as well as the nonlinear Eikonal equation Eq.(26), which provides the advection-velocity relation for the fast wave, are compared with numerical results directly obtained from Eqs. (12)-(13). We find, that the results from the nonlinear Eikonal equation lie below the numerical results in each case. This is in accordance with the propagation velocity of the fast wave solution $c^f|_{A=0}$ calculated with the singular perturbation theory, which lies below the exact results in the whole parameter regime (except for some parameter values close to the saddle-node bifurcation point, where perturbation theory is less accurate). The larger ε is, the larger is the deviation, as the calculations depend on small values of ε.

In addition, we find that the advection-velocity relation for the slow wave is more accurate compared to the nonlinear Eikonal equation. This again is in accordance with the singular perturbation theory, which in the shown parameter regime provides more accurate results for the slow wave velocity $c^s|_{A=0}$ than for the fast wave velocity $c^f|_{A=0}$. Close to the point where the fast wave branch and the slow wave branch meet, the advection-velocity relation for the slow wave deviates more strongly from numerical results, because perturbation theory does not capture the bifurcation behaviour.

Furthermore, the analytical results become less accurate for large negative adevction $A < 0$, because the results are obtained using a singular perturbation theory depending on small changes in ε^*, see Sec.III B, and $\varepsilon^* = \varepsilon(1 - \frac{A}{c(A)})$ Eqs. (16)-(17) increases




FIG. 3. Propagation velocity c as a function of advection strength A. The grey dashed-dotted lines show the velocity of the fast wave calculated from the nonlinear Eikonal equation ($c_+^f(A)$ of Eq.(26)). The grey dashed lines show the slow wave velocity derived from Eq.(27) ($c_+^s(A)$). The blue solid lines show the results numerically computed from Eqs. (12)-(13). a) $\varepsilon = 0.022$, b) $\beta = 1.59$.

for increasing absolute value of advection strength $A < 0$.

Fig.4 shows the critical time scale ratio ε_{cr}, a property of FitzHugh-Nagumo system without advection Eqs. (1)-(2), see Sec.III C, as a function of threshold β. For $\varepsilon > \varepsilon_{cr}$, the system is non-excitable. The analytical results from Eq.(28) are compared to numerical results directly obtained from Eqs. (1)-(2). We find, that for $\varepsilon < 0.1$, Eq.(28) provides a good approximation for the critical time scale ratio ε_{cr}, the absolute error is less than 0.01. For larger values of ε, the deviation increases,




FIG. 4. Critical time scale ratio ε_{cr} as a function of threshold β. The grey dashed line shows the results derived from Eq.(28); the blue solid line shows the results numerically computed results from Eqs. (1)-(2). $A = 0$ in each case.

because Eq.(28) is based on a singular perturbation theory depending on small values of ε.

Fig.5 shows the propagation velocity $c|_{A=0}$ as a function of threshold β. Numerical results obtained from Eqs. (1)-(2) show the branches of the fast wave and the slow wave for varying time scale ratio ε. The fast wave branch and the slow wave branch meet at a critical velocity $c_{cr}|_{A=0}$. The analytical expression for the critical velocity $c_{cr}|_{A=0}$ Eq.(29) is compared to the numerical results. The larger the threshold β is, the better is the analytical approximation: For large threshold β the saddle-node bifurcation, where the fast wave branch meets the slow wave branch, occurs for smaller time scale ratio ε, which in turn improves the results from the singular perturbation theory. The analytical results systematically lie below the numerical results, which is a consequence of the analytical result for the propagation velocity of the fast wave $c^f|_{A=0}$ being to small over a large range of parameters, see above.

Fig.6 shows the propagation velocity of the fast,




FIG. 5. Critical propagation velocity $c_{cr}|_{A=0}$ as a function of threshold β (grey dashed line) derived from Eq.(29). The marked position (dots) on this line correspond to $\varepsilon = 0.002, 0.004, 0.01, 0.022, 0.04, 0.07, 0.1, 0.15$. The solid lines show the propagation velocity $c|_{A=0}$ of the fast and the slow wave as a function of threshold β numerically computed from Eqs. (1)-(2) with. The color code indicates the same ε, $A = 0$ in each case. Note that $\varepsilon = 0.2$ is not in the co-domain of Eq. (28), see Fig. 4.




FIG. 6. Critical propagation velocity $c_{cr}(A_{cr})$ as a function of threshold β (grey dashed line) derived from Eq.(32) with ε_{cr} from Eq.(28) and $c_{cr}|_{A=0}$ from Eq.(29). The coloured solid lines show the propagation velocity $c(A)$ of the fast and the slow wave numerically computed from Eqs. (12)-(13) with varying advection strength A ($A = -0.5, -0.4, -0.3, -0.2, -0.1, 0.0, 0.1, 0.2$). $\varepsilon = 0.022$ in each case.

$c^f(A)$, and the slow, $c^s(A)$, wave affected by advection of varying strength A as a function of threshold β. The branches of the fast and the slow wave velocity are numerically obtained from Eqs. (12)-(13). Also here, the fast and the slow wave branch meet at a critical velocity $c_{cr}(A)$. In addition, the analytical result for the critical velocity in the presence of adveveption Eq.(32) is shown. It provides the same characteristic trend as the numerical results. Referring to systems without advection, the propagation velocity $c(A)$ is decelerated for negative advection strength $A < 0$. The propagation boundary ∂P (connection between fast and slow wave branch) is shifted to smaller threshold β. Traveling waves affected by positive advection $A > 0$ are accelerated, the propagation boundary ∂P is shifted to larger threshold β.

A theoretical explanation of the stabilizing effect of postive advection has been found: every parameter point in the (ε, β) space can be allocated a critical velocity (Eq.(32)). Media without advection are excitable, if the propagation velocity of the fast wave is larger than this critical velocity (parameter regime above the critical line in Fig.(4)) and non-excitable, if the propagation velocity of the fast wave is smaller than this critical velocity (parameter regime below the critical line in Fig.(4)). Negative advection $A < 0$ causes a deceleration of traveling waves, which in turn can induce a destabilization of an originally stable wave, if the fast wave is decelerated below the critical velocity $c_{cr}(A_{cr})$[16]. On the contrary, positive advection $A > 0$ causes an acceleration of traveling waves, which in fact can induce stable wave propagation in the former non-excitable parameter regime, if the fast wave is accelerated above the critical velocity $c_{cr}(A_{cr})$.

In Fig.(7), the critical advection strength A_{cr} is shown in the (β, A) parameter space for two different values of time scale ratio ε. The analytical results from Eq.(33) are compared to numerical results obtained from




FIG. 7. Critical advection strength A_{cr} as a function of threshold β for two different values of time scale ratio ε (a) $\varepsilon = 0.022$; b) $\varepsilon = 0.1$). The grey dashed line shows the results derived from Eq.(33) with ε_{cr} from Eq.(28) and $c_{cr}(A_{cr})$ from Eq.(29); the blue solid lines show the results numerically computed from Eqs. (12)-(13). The propagation boundary $\partial P_{A=0}$ is numerically computed from Eqs. (1)-(2).




FIG. 8. The critical surface in the (ε, β, A) parameter space derived from Eq.(34) separates the excitable (below) and the non-excitable (above) parameter regime.

Eqs. (12)-(13). We find, that Eq.(33) provides the same characteristic trend as numerical results, but deviates strongly from numerical line for large negative adevction strength $A < 0$, as in this case ε^* Eq. (17) is very large, and thus the singular perturbation theory breaks down. The critical line in the (β, A) parameter space separates the excitable ($A > A_{cr}$) and the non-excitable ($A < A_{cr}$) parameter regime. Compared to systems without advection, the propagation boundary ∂P is shifted to smaller threshold β for negative advection $A < 0$ and to larger threshold β for positive advection $A > 0$.

Fig.8 finally shows the critical surface in the (ε, β, A) parameter space derived from Eq.(34). It separates the excitable and the non-excitable parameter space, for values of ε above the critical surface, propagating waves are not supported.

V. CONCLUSION

In this work, we described the dependency of the propagation velocity of an unstable slow traveling wave $c^s(A)$ on advection of strength A analytically (Eq.(27)) and numerically. We have shown, that positive advection $A > 0$, corresponding to a constant field externally applied parallel to the propagation direction respectively corresponding to a small positive curvature (V-shaped pattern), can induce stable propagation of traveling waves in the non-excitable parameter regime. This behaviour is explained analytically: Every point in the (ε, β) space, where ε is the time scale ratio and β is a measure for the threshold of the system, is related to a critical velocity $c_{cr}(A_{cr})$ (Eq.(32)). $c_{cr}(A_{cr})$ is the propagation velocity at a saddle-node bifurcation of an unstable slow and a stable fast traveling wave solution, thus the minimal possible velocity of the fast wave solution. Stable wave propagation in the non-excitable parameter regime now is induced by accelerating the fast wave velocity above the critical velocity by affecting it with advection larger than a critical advection strength A_{cr} (Eq.(33)). We derived an analytical approximation of a critical surface in the (ε, β, A) space (Eq.(34)), above which wave propagation is impossible. Finally, we confirmed numerically, that the calculated dependencies of the critical velocity $c_{cr}(A_{cr})$ and the critical advection strength A_{cr} on β and ε are valid in the in systems

without advection excitable and non-excitable parameter regimes.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung (BMBF 01GQ1109) and by DFG in the framework of SFB 910.

[1] J. P. Keener and J. J. Tyson, "Spiral waves in the belousov-zhabotinskii reaction," Physica D **21**, 307 (1986).

[2] R. Kapral and K. Showalter, eds., *Chemical Waves and Patterns* (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1995).

[3] A. L. Hodgkin and A. F. Huxley, "A quantitative description of membrane current and its application to conduction and excitation in nerve," J. Physiol. **117**, 500 (1952).

[4] A. A. P. Leão, "Spreading depression of activity in the cerebral cortex," J. Neurophysiol. **7**, 359–390 (1944).

[5] J. P. Dreier, "The role of spreading depression, spreading depolarization and spreading ischemia in neurological disease," Nat. Med. **17**, 439–447 (2011).

[6] P. Camacho and J. D. Lechleiter, "Increased frequency of calcium waves in Xenopus laevis oocytes that express a calcium-ATPase," Science **260**, 226–229 (1993).

[7] M. Falcke, L. Tsimring, and H. Levine, "Stochastic spreading of intracellular Ca^{2+} release," Phys. Rev. E **62**, 2636 (2000).

[8] S. Jakubith, H. H. Rotermund, W. Engel, A. von Oertzen, and G. Ertl, "Spatiotemporal concentration patterns in a surface reaction: Propagating and standing waves, rotating spirals, and turbulence," Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 3013 (1990).

[9] C. Beta, M. G. Moula, A. S. Mikhailov, H. H. Rotermund, and G. Ertl, "Excitable CO oxidation on Pt(110) under nonuniform coupling," Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 188302 (2004).

[10] M. Bär, M. Falcke, M. Hildebrand, M. Neufeld, H. Engel, and M. Eiswirth, "Chemical turbulence and standing waves in a surface reaction model: The influence of global coupling and wave instabilities," Int. J. Bifur. Chaos **4**, 499 (1994).

[11] H. Sevcikova and M. Marek, "Chemical waves in electric-field modeling," Physica D **21**, 61 (1986).

[12] M. Gómez-Gesteira, J. Mosquera, V. A. Davydov, V. Pérez-Muñuzuri, A. P. Muñuzuri, V. Morozov, and V. Pérez-Villar, "Link between the effect of an electric field on wave propagation and the curvature-velocity relation," Physics Letters A **231**, 389 (1997).

[13] O. Steinbock, J. Schütze, and S. C. Müller, "Electric-field-induced drift and deformation of spiral waves in an excitable medium," Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 248 (1992).

[14] J. M. Chomaz, "Absolute and convective instabilities in nonlinear systems," Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 1931 (1992).

[15] B. Grafstein, "Locus of propagation of spreading cortical depression," J. Neurophysiol. **19**, 308–316 (1956).

[16] V. S. Zykov, *Simulation of Wave Processes in Excitable Media* (John Wiley & Sons Ltd (english translation from 1992), Moscow, 1984).

[17] J. J. Tyson and J. P. Keener, "Singular perturbation theory of traveling waves in excitable media (a review)," Physica D **32**, 327 (1988).

[18] P. Foerster, S. C. Müller, and B. Hess, "Curvature and propagation velocity of chemical waves," Science **241**, 685–687 (1988).

[19] O. Steinbock, V. Zykov, and S. C. Müller, "Control of spiral-wave dynamics in active media by periodic modulation of excitability," Nature **366**, 322–324 (1993).

[20] A. Yochelis and M. Sheintuch, "Drifting solitary waves in a reaction-diffusion medium with differential advection." Phys. Rev. E **81**, 025203 (2010).

[21] V. A. Davydov, N. Manz, O. Steinbock, and S. C. Müller, "Critical properties of excitation waves on curved surfaces: Curvature-dependent loss of excitability," Europhys. Lett. **59**, 344 (2002).

[22] K. F. Bonhoeffer, "Activation of passive iron as a model for the excitation of nerve," J. Gen. Physiol. **32**, 69–91 (1948).

[23] R. FitzHugh, "Impulses and physiological states in theoretical models of nerve membrane," Biophys. J. **1**, 445 (1961).

[24] J. Nagumo, S. Arimoto, and S. Yoshizawa, "An active pulse transmission line simulating nerve axon." Proc. IRE **50**, 2061 (1962).

[25] P. K. Brazhnik and V. A. Davydov, "Non-spiral autowave structures in unrestricted excitable media," Physics Letters A **199**, 40 (1995).

[26] M. Krupa, B. Sandstede, and P. Szmolyan, "Fast and slow waves in the fitzhugh-nagumo equation," J. Diff. Eq. **133**, 49 (1997).

[27] R. G. Casten, H. Cohen, and P. A. Lagerstrom, "Perturbation analysis of an approximation to the hodgkin-huxley theory," Quart.Appl.Math. **32**, 365 (1975).

VII. APPENDIX

A. Critical advection strength derived from nonlinear Eikonal equation

The nonlinear Eikonal equation is given by (see Eq.(26))

$$c_{\pm}^{f}(A) = \frac{1}{2}((A + c_0 + \varepsilon c_1) \pm \sqrt{(A + c_0 + \varepsilon c_1)^2 - 4\varepsilon A c_1}). \tag{35}$$

The propagation velocity $c_{+}^{f}(A)$ remains real only, if the discriminant is larger than zero. Hence the limiting allowable advection strength A_{cr} is determined by

$$(A_{cr} + c_0 + \varepsilon c_1)^2 - 4\varepsilon A_{cr} c_1 = 0. \tag{36}$$

Solving Eq.(36) for A_{cr} yields

$$A_{cr}^{\pm} = -(c_0 - \varepsilon c_1 \pm 2\sqrt{-c_0 \varepsilon c_1}). \tag{37}$$

The critical advection strength A_{cr} is A_{cr}^{-}, because $|A_{cr}^{+}| > |A_{cr}^{-}|$.

B. Expression for c_0, c_1^f and c_1^s

The exact analytical expression for the propagation velocity of the stable fast inner solution of FitzHugh-Nagumo model to lowest order of ε is

$$c_0 = \sqrt{\frac{D}{2}}(u_1 + u_3 - 2u_2), \tag{38}$$

with u_1, u_2 and u_3 being the intersection points of the u-nullcline with the inhibitor fixpoint $v_0 = -3\beta + \beta^3$, $u_1 = -\beta$, $u_2 = \frac{\beta}{2} - \sqrt{3 - 3/4\beta^2}$, and $u_3 = \frac{\beta}{2} + \sqrt{3 - 3/4\beta^2}$.

The correction to first order of ε of the propagation velocity of the inner stable fast wave solution considering solitary waves is

$$c_1^f = -\frac{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} v_1 \frac{\partial u_0}{\partial \xi} e^{-c_0 \xi} d\xi}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (\frac{\partial u_0}{\partial \xi})^2 e^{-c_0 \xi} d\xi} \tag{39}$$

where v_1,

$$v_1(\xi) = \frac{1}{c_0}(u_3 - u_1)(\xi + (\frac{\sqrt{2}}{u_3 - u_1} \ln(1 + e^{-\frac{u_3 - u_1}{\sqrt{2}}\xi})), \tag{40}$$

is the correction to first order of ε of the inhibitor concentration (inner solution) of the fast wave and u_0,

$$u_0(\xi) = \frac{u_1 + u_3}{2} + \frac{u_1 - u_3}{2} \tanh(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{u1 - u3}{2} \xi), \tag{41}$$

is the (exact) inner solution of the activator concentration to order zero of ε.

The correction to order $\sqrt{\varepsilon}$ of the propagation velocity of the inner unstable slow wave solution is

$$c_1^s = \sqrt{\frac{2\sqrt{2m} - 2l \ln \alpha}{\frac{(2m)^{(3/2)}}{3} - \frac{l^2}{2}\sqrt{2m} + \frac{l(l^2 - 2m)}{2} \ln \alpha}}, \tag{42}$$

where $\alpha = \sqrt{\frac{l + \sqrt{2m}}{l - \sqrt{2m}}}$ and $l = \frac{2}{3}(-2u_1 + u_2 + u_3)$ and $m = (u_2 - u_1)(u_3 - u_1)$. For details, see Ref.[27].